

CANDOUR

Founded by A. K. Chesterton in 1953 to defend National Sovereignty against the menace of International Finance
Vol. XXXV, No. 2 and 3 Registered at the G.P.O. as a Newspaper February/March, 1984

The British Views-Letter

WHEREIN LIES THE TRUE REVOLUTION

by PAUL MATTHEWS

Over the last year or so there has been a tendency on the part of a section of what is vaguely called the 'Radical Right' (a wholly inappropriate epithet for a form of nationalism that is neither radical, which means little, nor right, which means nothing) to talk of *national revolution*.

Now there are many in the nationalist camp to whom the very word 'revolution' is anathema; there is something uneasy about standing at the end of a tradition of patriotism and anti-communism, and turning to face these two words 'national' and 'revolution' sitting side by side — and somehow looking so very comfortable together. It is enough to send all this much-vaunted business about 'Left' and 'Right' to the four winds, which is quite where it belongs.

The problem for nationalists is one that arises through standing on the same spot for too long. It is this: that as soon as one thinks of revolution one thinks of communists. It is a matter of immediate association, derived from the fact that one sees the communists as having a monopoly right to revolution: they have a monopoly right because they hold the copy-right — a copy-right forged out of the great prototypes of revolution, the French and the Russian.

It would be no bad thing if we nationalists took a step or two to one side and viewed all this from a new angle. If nothing else, our heads might be cleared by a little fresh air.

Red Revolution Means Repression

We must recognise, however, that we have no need to be *too* self-critical, for our traditional view is not wholly misleading: we have, to be fair, a pretty clear sight already of the facts; it is our conclusions that need a little airing. We know enough, for instance, of Red revolution to realise that it means for the mass of ordinary working people just one thing: a change of master; and we know, secondly, that in practice this has always been a change for the worse.

In each instance, Red revolution has meant the overthrow of an order that had at least the justification of history and blood, and its replacement by new revolutionary *elites*: hard, brutal, self-seeking

elites. We know this to have been the case in every successful revolution — whether liberal-democratic or bolshevist — from 1789 to the present day. And we know its reason: these revolutions were against the people, quite simply because they were not *of* the people: they were the work of international judaeo-freemasonry. Not one of these revolutions has been an uprising of the poor; on the contrary, they have all been financed by, and served the interests of, the rich.

We are bound, therefore, to face the question: how true a revolution is the Red revolution?

This much is certain: the only group to benefit from such revolutions has been that Masonic coterie which, from the French Revolution onwards, has been spreading its control, through its parallel mechanisms of capitalism and communism, over the rest of mankind; enforcing its role not by love of the poor, but by fear and hatred.

Here is the truth of it: to treat the ordinary people of this world merely as pawns in an international power-struggle; to treat them as the slaving and enslaved cogs in the wheels of a capitalist or communist system, producing wealth for the few and, by their submission or their votes (it is all the same thing), giving power to unkind and faceless masters. This is no revolution at all! It is repression, and only repression.

Type And Anti-Type

It is startling to compare all this with a programme of true nationalism: the returning of the people to the land, and of the land to the people; freedom from the tyranny of money and of the State; government that is of the people, and for them; the creation of an economic system that is internalised and based upon the family, allowing the people to produce a sufficiency for themselves instead of an over-sufficiency for others; the restoration of charity and compassion in the place of individualism and licence — now *this* is revolutionary!

And thus it becomes that the moment one ceases to see oneself merely as defending ones country against communism, and realises that it needs to be defended against the capitulo-Masonic demon already possessing it: at *this* moment one sees the need for

true revolution — national revolution — and becomes a revolutionary.

The analysis, however, does not end there. It only begins. For if one looks at successful Red revolutionaries, one sees almost a certain *type*: hard, determined, brutal, believing that the end justifies the means: the good Nietzschean. Now in the same way there will be a clear type of true revolutionary, and it is a mistake to imagine that he must imitate his enemy. On the contrary, attractive as may be the idea of taking up the enemy's weapons to use against him, it is essential to understand that both capitalism and communism are implicit in their own pragmatism; so that to adopt a merely pragmatic method is to breathe the air of the enemy and be poisoned.

No! The true revolutionary must be the *anti-type* of his enemy: in place of pragmatism, he will have philosophy; in place of unscrupulousness, he will have faith. Thus, it is that the true revolution begins *within*.

Path Of The True Revolutionary

There is, therefore, no *immediate necessity* for the true revolutionary (unlike his opponent, who relies on fear and fraud) to raise himself upon crutches and weaponry or money. Though unarmed, his very idealism and spirit of self-sacrifice will be his strength; though poor, his poverty will be the measure of his dedication.

What may, therefore, seem weakness is, in fact, strength: for whilst the pragmatist — the Marxist, the freemason — is *dependent* upon his money, his influence, his capacity for violence, the true revolutionary is free: he is not bound by the means and mechanisms of achieving his end — *for he embodies the end in himself*. He is not concerned for power in itself, but with a philosophy. Thus to the end is the true revolutionary the anti-type of that grotesque caricature draped in red and drenched in blood.

Does this all sound too much, too hopeless? It need not. Though the path of a true revolutionary is the way of hardship and pain, it contains its own strength; for it is thereby also a way of courage, of struggle and over-coming.

It is a path, what is more, that was taken nearly two thousand years ago at the beginning of the greatest of all revolutions: the revolution that began so quietly and humbly with a young girl gently spreading her arms, and with downcast eyes saying: 'Be it done unto me according to Thy word.' It is a path leading down from that moment through all history, echoing with the words of a Founder who promised His followers not peace, but a sword; not riches, but poverty: not power, but service; not

comfort, but a Cross.

Thus stands the supreme anti-type of the traditional Red revolutionary, pointing the way to a revolution that overturns not only the *externals* of society — rulers and socio-economic systems — but delves into the very depths of men; pointing the way to a revolution based not on power and greed, but on self-giving.

Aflame With An Ideal

It is well worth taking time to look — the closer the better — at this profoundest of all revolutions; the Christian, the Catholic. For as soon as one grasps even a faint idea of its magnitude — of the fact that it has endured, as a *continuous revolution* for two thousand years; of the fact that it has formed and informed the culture and conscience of Europe — one cannot but be astonished that so much can have been achieved by something apparently so flimsy and defenceless in the face of constant hostility. For this fact is of the first importance: that from the very moment when its Founder lay, already an outcast, in the poverty of a manger presecution had begun to the sound of parents weeping over the bodies of their slaughtered infants. Thus was Herod a herald; not a Herald Angel, but an angel of darkness, heralding the persecution that has never since ceased.

The great mystery, then — and here is the lesson for national revolutionaries — is that something outwardly so weak and vulnerable can yet have survived unremitting attack, and triumphed. Yet the solution to the paradox, like the nature of the revolution, lies within: for if one looks closely enough one may perchance catch a glimpse of the fire that dances in the hearts of the saints and martyrs; and in that glimpse one can understand a part, at least, of the answer.

For when men can look at the might of the world — at its terrors and its gold — and *look straight through* these things, as though they did not exist; when men can look so because their hearts are aflame with an ideal upon which their eyes are fixed, and for which they will sacrifice themselves for very love; when men can look thus at the world, it becomes possible to understand how something flimsy and despised can yet be feared — for it is a real revolution.

CANDOUR SUBSCRIPTION RATES

Subscribe Today!

U.K.	£4.00
Overseas airmail	£4.50
U.S.A. Dollar Rate	\$10.00

Forest House, Liss Forest, Hants GU33 7DD

E.C. ROAD TO MONOPOLY

by R. E. BROOKS

As an Englishman living in Europe, I am able to observe at first hand the 'workings' of the Common Market — the so-called 'European Community'.

Actually, the European Community has more to do with the centralisation of power, a potential department of world government, than it has with European culture and civilisation. Many have 'let the cat out of the bag' from time to time: Edward Heath, the former Tory Prime Minister, said at the time Great Britain and Northern Ireland joined the E.E.C.: "There is also the market of eastern Europe." He meant, no doubt, the Communist bloc. I was told in Germany the other day that soon all countries would be controlled by a centralised committee: raw materials, agriculture, industry and distribution would be 'internationalised', with all nations abolished. The individual would likewise be supervised, so I was told, by those who claim to hold our best interests to the fore.

Collectivising The Individual

I am against both the importation of food from the European Community and a policy of world supplies. I see no good reason that we should not grow and produce even more than we do already. Every attempt is being made to destroy the smallholder, the small family farmer, in Great Britain. Agriculture, like modern industry, is being collectivised and monopolised — I see no difference in that from Marxism, as practised by the Soviets. I remember well, in my youth, the Tories used to have something to say about 'free enterprise': the family grocer, small businessman and factory owner. Nowadays, the Tories say nothing about them; in fact, most have long since been despatched to make way for the monopolist and international financier. When everything is collectivised and economic power is centralised, what choice has the individual got?

Many of the super-markets in the U.K. are now part and parcel of European organisations, with similar super-markets in France, Benelux, Germany and Italy. These organisations are also buying farming land whenever they can do so. Many 'farmers' in the farm house' are no longer the owners or even tenants of the farms; they are managers working for the 'organisation'. Nobody can tell me that this is not moving towards a kind of dictatorship — one in which there would be no escape for the individual, collectivised and centralised through the power of big business.

Sometime back, Mr. Peter Walker told pork producers in England to export their produce. So we export our pork and bacon to 'organisations' in Holland which, in turn, sell to the Soviet bloc; then we in turn import bacon and ham from Denmark as well as Poland and Rumania! For the fourth Christmas in succession, West German television has shown viewers a report from Poland of its people queueing for food. It is well known that they are on food rationing. West German farmers are complaining about imports: butter from Holland, despite the fact the Germans have produced a surplus of dairy products; butter from Ireland as well as France; but low and behold, stacks and stacks of poultry, game, tinned meats and vegetables from starving Poland.

Shortly before Marxist Willy Brandt fell from high office over a spy scandal, he set the ball rolling with Poland. West German bankers were to finance the supply of industrial capital goods from the West, and Poland was to attempt the impossible: to pay for high technology with supplies of food products that the West Germans were already producing in abundance! The high technology the Poles are receiving is being used mainly to increase weapon production, not only in Poland but also for the Soviets.

A representative of a local branch of the West German farmers told me some while back that farming in Europe since the last war had been 'Americanised' as well as 'Sovietised'. He said that West Germany was forced by trade agreements to import from the U.S.A. 'high-powered' animal fodder supplies, producing unnatural quantities of dairy products, eggs, meat, etc. "If you try to revert to natural methods of farming, they cut off the subsidies," he added.

Both Mrs. Thatcher and President Reagan have voiced "deep concern" about the growing military might of the Soviets. Yet the U.S.A. continues to supply them with grain as well as beef, and so does the E.C. likewise supply butter and beef. This leaves the Soviets more manpower and energy to increase their gigantic and still-growing weapon production. It does not stop there: Great Britain is only *one* western nation that supplies capital goods and machinery to the Soviets.

We certainly do not need processed milk from France: once again the 'international' supermarkets are behind that. So we hit back at the French by sending English and Welsh lamb to them. The New Zealanders (and *how*) are stepping up supplies of

their mutton to the Continent as well as to the U.K. A few years ago, New Zealand was given, despite objections from the populace there, a sharp injection of debt by world bankers. The struggle now is to pay off that debt by sending bigger supplies of lamb and fruit produce abroad, mainly to Western Europe, although some supplies are going into the Red bloc via Holland.

The so-called under-developed countries cannot pay off their debts to the 'international finance club', and they never will do so. To feed the monster of debt finance, the I.M.F. have demanded higher taxes for the developed industrialised nations, *which means*

us. Mrs. Thatcher can do nothing about taxation under the present rules of finance.

Debt finance, inflation, high taxation are all contributing together with big business to standardise the Western European nations and reduce the individual to a kind of 'planned thing', making personal choice impossible and automatically setting up a dictatorship through centralisation. That is what the European Community is really all about, and it will not be very long before we see steps taking the E.C. into Comecon, producing a Common Market from Ireland to the Soviet/Chinese border. All this will be in the interests of peace, of course!

EUROPEAN ELECTION BRIEF

Stickers And Posters

Poole Anti-Common Market Group now have available stickers reading EURO-TRAP — DON'T VOTE for use in the May elections for the so-called European Assembly. Enquiries should be sent to the Group's Secretary, Mr. F. A. Holmes, 29 Haverstock Road, Bournemouth BH9 3HQ. Window stickers reading DON'T VOTE — IT ONLY ENCOURAGES THEM may also be ordered now, through *Liverpool Newsletter* (17 Hadassah Grove, Lark Lane, Liverpool L17 8XH). Please accompany orders with a large stamped, addressed envelope.

Door-To-Door Leaflets

Mr. Anthony Cooney recommends the following as the text for a door-to-door leaflet.

ABSTAIN!

TO TAKE ANY PART WHATSOEVER IN THE ELECTIONS FOR THE SO-CALLED EUROPEAN PARLIAMENT IS AN ACT OF SEDITION AGAINST HER MAJESTY THE QUEEN'S SOVEREIGNTY IN THE UNITED KINGDOM. WE THEREFORE CALL UPON ALL LOYAL BRITONS TO ABSTAIN FROM VOTING.

AS A RESULT OF THE ABSTAIN CAMPAIGN IN 1979 OVER 80% OF THE ELECTORATE DEMONSTRATED THEIR CONTEMPT OF THE CANDIDATES BY NOT VOTING, LEAVING THE "WINNERS" IN NO DOUBT THAT THEY HAD NO MANDATE WHATSOEVER FROM THE LOYAL BRITISH PEOPLE.

THE E.E.C. BUREAUCRATS ARE SO SCARED OF THIS HAPPENING AGAIN THAT THEY ARE PROVIDING THE POLITICAL PARTY HACKS WITH FIVE MILLION POUNDS OF YOUR MONEY TO PERSUADE YOU TO VOTE.

BY NOT VOTING YOU WIN: AND IT IS THE

ONLY WAY YOU, THE VOTERS, CAN WIN THIS ELECTION.

DON'T WASTE YOUR VOTE BY CASTING IT — TO DO SO IS THE ACT OF A TRAITOR.

Printed and published by Committee of

Press Release

This is the text of the press release available from *Liverpool Newsletter*. Those individuals and groups requiring copies should order them *before April 5th*, and orders should be accompanied by a large, stamped addressed envelope.

COMMITTEE OF AGAINST THE COMMON MARKET

SECRETARY

ADDRESS

PRESS STATEMENT

A COMMITTEE OF AGAINST THE COMMON MARKET HAS BEEN FORMED IN

TO TAKE ANY PART IN THE ELECTIONS FOR THE SO-CALLED EUROPEAN PARLIAMENT, EVEN BY SPOILING A VOTE, IS AN ACT OF SEDITION AGAINST HER MAJESTY THE QUEEN'S SOVEREIGNTY IN THE UNITED KINGDOM.

AS NO CHRISTIAN MAY IN CONSCIENCE VOTE OR TAKE PART IN A SEDITIOUS SITUATION THIS COMMITTEE WILL ENERGETICALLY CANVASS ALL ELECTORS IN ITS AREA TO ABSTAIN IN THE COMING EUROPEAN ELECTIONS.

Readers may, of course, prepare their own press releases. What is *important* is that their press releases arrive over the course of the week before April 25th in the postbags of selected newspapers in all parts of the country.

MAU MAU AND THE MONARCHY

by A. K. CHESTERTON

Kenya is the supreme symbol to date, not only of the breakdown of British decency and the total withering of the British will to greatness, but no less of the cynicism and sheer wickedness of the British Government in enthroning the vilest savages and abandoning to their murderous vengeance those many people, European and African, whose loyalty to the Crown once upon a time — and this not so long ago — would have been regarded as earning for them a reciprocal loyalty in the form of protection and honoured pledges. To our eternal dishonour must it be said that there has been no such reciprocity. Not even a pretence of it.

Although the temporary continuance of British officers in the King's African Rifles (now known as the Kenya Rifles) and in the police force has so far — with the exception of the turbulence caused by understandable Somali discontent in the Northern Frontier Province — prevented the outbreak of the violence innate in the situation caused by Britain's withdrawal, that abdication is nevertheless far more infamous than was the withdrawal of the Belgians from the Congo, despite the fact that the latter territory was plunged at once into an orgy of murder, rape and rapine.

The Congo, after all, was handed over to the nominal care of the petty crook, Patrice Lumumba — nominal, because in truth the abdication was in favour of ravenous financial wolves working behind an American-Swedish "front" organization — whereas Kenya has been presented as a gift to the creator and manager of the revolting Mau Mau cult, the diabolical Kenyatta, who — as the people of Kenya were falsely assured by British officialdom — was never to be allowed to return to the normal life of the country and whom, only a couple of years ago, Her Majesty's Governor described as "a leader to darkness and death."

During the Emergency many Europeans met with appalling deaths and thousands of Kikuyu were foully butchered for the lethal crime of remaining lieges of Her Britannic Majesty in the face of sustained Mau Mau intimidation and terror. How have the faithful among the surviving Kikuyu been rewarded? What are the rewards of the Europeans in Kenya who brought civilisation to this savage land, who in thousands of instances were invited by British Governments to settle there with the solemn promise that the White Highlands should be theirs in perpetuity, and who played the leading part in

suppressing the obscene and murderous Mau Mau revolt? The reward of the loyal Kikuyu is to be handed over to the conquered (and yet now all conquering) beasts who tortured and slew their kinsmen and whose pangas hacked unborn children out of the wombs of their kinswomen. The reward of the loyal Britons — those who cannot make their escape — is to be left helpless amidst the never-to-be-abated hazards of existence among enfranchised savages now accorded powers of life and death over them.

The shape of things to come in Kenya having long been apparent, the *Candour*-League of Empire Loyalists movement in the United Kingdom and elsewhere in the British world has for many years fought bitterly and without ceasing to stave off the impending betrayal of Kenya, and it has done so without allies. All parties in the House of Commons and the House of Lords in greater or less degree have either helped to promote or at the least have acquiesced in the betrayal. So have all the Christian Churches. So have the national newspapers. So have the British Broadcasting Company and I.T.A. Our movement in addition has had to fight the Fifth Column in Kenya of those Europeans, whether led by Michael Blundell or by Bruce MacKenzie, who sold out the White civilizers of the country in their frenzy to climb aboard one or other of the African band-wagons.

As though this were not enough, we had to contend with the gyrations of Kenya's so-called "Right-Wing" leaders who, after rushing from one futility to another, have either evanesced or gone over to the Mau Mau victors. One among them, whose periodical was banned not so long ago because it dared to put the then undegenerate White point of view, appeared recently on television in Nairobi to pay the most fulsome tributes to Kenyatta and even refer to him as "the Grand Old Man of Kenya."

Petition Unacknowledged

Confronting the ever-increasing putridity of the betrayal — and to a considerable extent the self-betrayal — of Kenya, we became more and more concerned lest members of the Royal Family should be asked to associate themselves with the final act of the obscene tragedy — the "Independence Day" celebrations at which the Union Jack was to be hauled down and a rag representing a disparate rabble of warring tribes flown in its place.

We sent from our Annual General Meeting a

petition to the Queen begging Her Majesty to take the necessary steps to preserve the honour of the Crown from the deep and lasting taint of such associations. Although it is the constitutional right of British subjects to petition the Sovereign, we received not so much as a reply. When later we heard that Prince Philip was to go to Kenya formally to make a gift of that beautiful country to the manager of Mau Mau, we sent a telegram beseeching His Royal Highness to take into account the feelings of those loyal subjects whose relatives had been killed defending Kenya against both her external and internal foes. Once again no word came to us from Buckingham Palace.

The second silence surprised us no less than did the first, because we remembered with what gay insouciance His Royal Highness had flown to Dar-es-Salaam to haul down with his own hands the British flag which many of us, still living, had trailed through the wilderness of German East Africa to hoist, often enough at the expense of health. Prince Philip showed no inclination to visit any of the graves of the soldiers who were killed in that harsh and heartbreaking campaign.

Finally there came the news that Kenyatta had done a deal with the remnant of the physically and Spiritually filthy Mau Mau remaining in the forests whereby they were to be accorded a place of honour at the Nairobi celebrations. In a desperate attempt to save the Royal Family from the ignominy its advisers were forcing upon it, I sent the following cable to Buckingham Palace:

"Following Kenyatta promise to allow Mau Mau chiefs attend independence celebration we beg Your Majesty still more urgently to dissociate Royal Family from the event. Any other course must dismay and wound European and loyal Kikuyu relatives of Mau Mau victims besides causing distress to soldiers who served your Royal Father and Grandfather in adjacent territories and bringing further deep disgrace to the British name in Africa.

"Your Majesty's loyal subject, A. K. Chesterton, Founder and Policy Director, League of Empire Loyalists."

This time there did come an answer, not from Buckingham Palace but from the Commonwealth Relations Office. It read:

"I am directed by Mr. Secretary Sandys to inform you that your telegram to the Queen of the 9th December was, by Her Majesty's command, referred to this Office but it has not been possible to advise Her Majesty to take any action thereon."

Thus did our efforts to safeguard the Crown, as so often before, end in the defeat and derision of a

chit from some obscure office-boy in Government service.

Jocular Prince

Prince Philip duly arrived in Nairobi to hand over the title-deeds of the country. He was in the jocular mood which His Royal Highness considers appropriate for such occasions. He joked with Kenyatta, asking him gaily if he was sure he did not wish to change his mind. He accepted from his host a party badge of the Kenya African National Union and wore it for all men, including the Kenya African Democratic Union opposition, to see. The tradition that the Royal Family stands above party politics, it would seem, had to give way before the imperious decree of Jomo Kenyatta.

True, His Royal Highness declined to meet the unwashed hoodlums who had emerged from the forests to witness the triumphant upshot of their devilry, but as he cavorted with the diabolist-in-chief who had inspired and activated the creatures there was little in the gesture to appease those Britons in Kenya who still retain some pride. Nor could the Europeans in the country have experienced much pleasure when they heard that Her Majesty had bestowed upon it her "uhuru" gift Sagana Lodge, which had been their own wedding gift to the Queen. Any feelings we may entertain about the public representation of personal gifts are no doubt bourgeois in origin and have no place in the realm of high politics.

I have said that on many previous occasions our petitions to Her Majesty achieved nothing more than a routine journey to the desk of some petty Governmental functionary. This time, however, we believed that as our representations concerned the Royal Family alone they would not be thus side-tracked but dealt with at Buckingham Palace. As has been seen, we were mistaken. In the matter of Prince Philip's official association with the leader to darkness and death the unsatisfactory figure of Mr. Secretary Sandys appears as the keeper of the Royal conscience and the arbiter of policies affecting the Royal honour.

We have long been aware that the constitutional right of the subject to petition the Crown has become a meaningless formality, but now, as a result of the Kenya lesson, we are obliged to face yet another and still more shattering fact. It is that in the fight for British interests, the first of which is surely to try to recover for Britain her great name, the Monarch is not on our side. Unknowingly, as I firmly believe, the Monarch is on the other side. For the men of my generation who fought in two world wars this knowledge is an especially cruel torment.

I am convinced that Her Majesty, when she declared her dedication to the British people in her coming-of-age speech at Cape Town, was completely sincere. I am no less convinced that her complete sincerity remains. Anybody surrounded and insulated as is the Queen by a phalanx of political advisers to whom treason has become not only a trade but a habit would require to be an exceptionally percipient and strong-minded person to see through the traitorous con—spiracies of our time, let alone to attempt to smash them. Her Majesty's many and shining virtues do not, it would seem, embrace this quality.

Fact Must Be Faced

The result is that in the choice between men and women who acknowledge full allegiance to the Crown and the convicted manager of Mau Mau, the Royal cachet is given willy-nilly to Kenyatta. This means, for all practical purposes, that loyalty has become a one-way traffic. However hard it may be, the fact is one that has to be accepted.

The function of the Monarch, in addition to

representing the nation's continuing entity, is to give protection to the people against their external and internal enemies. We must now make up our minds that such protection is no longer forthcoming. Over the last several years the Royal support has ultimately been given to our enemies in every part of the world where a crisis of subversion has developed.

Does the fact of the abandonment by the Monarchy of loyalist causes mean that we should withdraw our own allegiance? No. It means the opposite. Our allegiance must be the stronger the more clearly we recognize the terrible truth of the situation and the more grimly we continue to fight to save our Monarchy from the evil influences which surround it.

Only people of character, possessed of great qualities, can sustain a one-sided loyalty. We must endeavour to cultivate those qualities, because they alone stand between the British people and the final triumph of Satanism.

This article was originally published in Candour in January 1964.

MONARCH OF 'MULTICULTURA'?

Following our reference in last month's *Candour* to the Queen's laying of a wreath at the tomb of Jomo Kenyatta during her visit in November to Kenya — *The Times* claimed "she is said greatly to have admired" the foul beast — it was with renewed concern that we read of Her Majesty's decision to make Samora Machel, Mozambique's Marxist dictator and another bloodstained "ex"-terrorist, a Knight Grand Cross of St. Michael and St. George. Peregrine Worsthorne recently observed, with his usual perception, that the common people of England no longer love the multi-cultural Commonwealth, but the Queen of England loves it more and more. Judging by Machel's red-carpet treatment during his visit here, and the now familiar tenor of her Christmas broadcast, Her Majesty's endorsement of multi-culturalism embraces well nigh all the "third world".

Of course, as A.K.C. made clear in his article twenty years ago, the Queen is not entirely to blame for all that she says and does. Indeed, the evidence suggests that she and her Royal Family are being wilfully exploited by the liberal, multi-racial establishment in pursuit of a warped and unnatural ideal that spells the ultimate destruction of our character and identity as a nation. Mr. Wade Smith of London E,17, a correspondent in *The Spectator* of December 17th, gave a small example of the process at work:

The Prince of Wales was invited to attend the opening of two local establishments in Waltham Forest and had accepted, when local Conservatives — attempting to ingratiate themselves with the shopkeeper electorate from the foreign Moslem republic known as Pakistan — suggested that the newly created Asian cultural centre should also be visited by the Prince and Princess. Naturally, the two original sites were scrubbed, and the royal visit was confined solely to the Asian immigrants with, as *The Spectator* reader commented, "the predictable growth of republican racism where none had existed before".

Mr. Smith went on to say: "Times have indeed changed since Kipling's 'sons of the blood' planted the English flag in the far-flung corners of Empire, but that is precisely the point. The Queen is now the Queen of England, Wales, Scotland and Northern Ireland, not the 'Head of the Commonwealth' in supposedly independent, largely communist Afro-Asia. Let us hope her compassionate yet intelligent son will regard himself as an Englishman rather than some hereditary president of an artificial state of 'Multicultura', established on our native soil against the will of the indigenous 'sovereign people' . . . The monarchy belongs first and foremost to the related populations who belong ancestrally to England, New Zealand, Australia and Anglo-Saxon Canada. Without the primary loyalty of these millions, there would be no monarchy here at all."

MORE LIBERTARIAN RED HERRINGS

by LESLIE VON GOETZ

I felt very sad at the reply to my article in the November/December issue of *Candour* — to find so many clichés crammed together in so small a space is mentally disorienting. If someone showers you with presents you may well wonder what their motives can be, you may well think you do not care to be thus obliged to them, but you would not normally wail that the benefactor is depriving you of the necessity to work. By providing you with comforts he is enabling you to choose what work you will do, how you will spend your time, etc., whereas otherwise you would *have* to toil for a pittance in the office or mine. So it is with these cheap foreign goods — they extend our range of choice, enable us to do other things. We do, actually, have to pay for them — either in goods or services. The handkerchief stitcher will be out of work but the insurance broker or the ship charterer will do well. Which would most people rather be?

If your author had read my article with a little more care, he would have noticed that I was not actually putting forward the disingenuous arguments he is at pains to answer — I was merely dismissing some arguments put forward in the original article by P. M. Jones. I do not like being misquoted — I said it was totally unnatural to force people to invest where they did not see any profit, and for that I am accused of Leninism. I said we felt in our bones that dispossessed whites in Africa *ought* to be allowed to take their possessions with them, and for this I am accused of wanting the state to wither away. Oh dear!

But the real point at issue is much more serious — unless the nationalists can understand it they will never achieve anything except the mayhem of the P.L.O. or the I.R.A. The end does not justify the means. The fact that when we get a nationalist government they will be full of good intentions will not justify them taking powers to which no government is entitled. British independence is valuable because it means freedom for Britons. There will be plenty of villains climbing on the Nationalist bandwagon long before power is a reality, and I do not want those villains given powers “in the name of the public good”, “sensible controls”, etc., which no government or civil servant should have. The recent *Horizon* programme showing how the Chinese enforce their “one-child family” policy was a perfect illustration of evil with a smiling face. Therefore, the nationalists now, far removed from power, should sit down very carefully and think just how *few* laws

they would need to make our country unattractive to the money power, or to those of alien stock.

Enthusiasm For Chaos

The fact that some controls work sometimes, temporarily, should not produce premature claims of success. After the fall of France, Hitler's Germany looked remarkably successful — five years later it was in ashes. Some young nationalists talk with such enthusiasm of the chaos of the crisis which will bring nationalists to power that I think they have forgotten, not just the misery that will be involved, but the horrors of the long years after when all the sacrifices turn out to have been in vain, when the concentration camps are full of former comrades and the villains drive their comfortable limousines to their dachas. All of this happens because power is attractive to the evil and the panics and upheavals of revolution provide justifications for powers which can never be discarded for fear of enemies. On the other hand, some quite minor changes in laws regarding land ownership, inheritance taxes or pension funds, not to mention limited liability, could suddenly make the game in Britain not worth the candle for most of the people we want to get out of positions of power. Judo rather than fisticuffs.

I have not read Andrew Brons' essay on Belloc but I am quite sure that redistributing wealth on meritocratic lines is a task quite beyond even the most impassioned reformer armed with every power. One man's merit, “ten children for the nation”, is another man's “irresponsible breeding”. A nurse looks after handicapped children — is she a deserving saint or should she be locked up for wasting valuable national resources on useless cripples? Even in a family, where the father controls all the income and sets the standards, how often does he realise on his deathbed that he made the wrong choices, deceived as to the merit of his nearest and dearest? Meritocracy is a truly fiendish attempt to equate God and Mammon, but it is really a rod in pickle for the nationalists because I do not believe they have that much in common with the wild-eyed women's libbers who want full state pay for mothers and housewives. There is a whole lot of merit lurking around waiting to be rewarded once meritocracy takes over. It will certainly need a gigantic bureaucracy to supervise the whole of British industry *as well*.

The author's preferences are only too plain when we are told that Albania is an example of successful controls — a country where a priest already in a

concentration camp can be sentenced to death for the crime of baptising a baby, also in the concentration camp!! Yes, of course controls can succeed in controlling. I was talking about achieving the objects for which the controls were imposed in the first place — a very different thing. One learns from experience indeed, but as Professor Hayek pointed out it is the disappointments which teach us the most. Bureaucrats learn little from their failures because they still get their salaries — other people pay the price. I rather think the Russians and the Albanians and the Germans have paid a very heavy price for falling for the kind of idealistic verbiage your author is so full of. And the Chinese and the Cubans. We don't have to *jump* from the frying pan into the fire, we might just succeed in turning off the gas if we took the time to see where the switch was. The alleged Japanese success is not only fragile in itself, but is also based on the fact that they have not been allowed to spend any money on defence. We can all be rich if we can get someone else to carry our overheads!

Finally, I would like to say that I would really like to know what is meant by the "flight of capital" which would justify all the draconian powers. I do not claim to be a professional economist — I would like to understand. We start with chaos in Britain in which it is conceivable a nationalist government might take power. What is the capital that flees? I can see a rich man, with homes in four countries — investments everywhere — deciding he can see little comfort in Britain and selling all his assets here as quickly as possible, but that seems to be quite a good prospect. His assets will be going much more cheaply for British people to buy. On the other hand, there may be such a rush to sell British assets that they will be going incredibly cheaply and positively tempt foreigners to buy — but that would be capital coming in, not fleeing. The real capital of this country is the native stock, the people, land, houses factories. These things *cannot* flee the country. They may pass into alien ownership, but a nationalist government can surely work out the rights and obligations of property owners with sufficient clarity in advance for the aliens to decide whether they want to take the risk of running a factory without limited liability or owning a farm without the right to pass the freehold on, etc. If in the imaginary financial crisis we do, in fact, find ourselves so surrounded by enemies that no one will trade with us then, like it or not, we shall have to be self-sufficient. But there is no need to go into a frenzy of paranoia and turn our own citizens into criminals and traitors because they fancy foreign goods. Rich people who buy

luxury goods usually make far more employment than if they were constrained to buy British. I find the picture of nationalist Britain meanspirited and grudging. It need not be so.

Editor's note — Owing to an oversight in proof-reading our November/December issue, we did not attribute the reply to Mrs. von Goetz's original article to Mr. David Michael.

PLUS CA CHANGE . . . ?

"We shall not be afraid to encourage enterprise and reward success," boasted The Leader, getting into the stride of her New Year's Address. The 1984 New Years Honours List, perhaps, is indicative of the type of entrepreneurial spirit she believes should be encouraged and rewarded by M.B.E.s, Knight-hoods and Life Peerages. An analysis by the admittedly Lefty Labour Research Department, reported in *The Times* last month, claims the Honours List shows the Government maintaining the practice of bestowing honours on businessmen whose companies have contributed to Conservative funds. Indeed, the L.R.D.'s study of Mrs. Thatcher's first eight honours lists estimates that companies that "dominated" Conservative fund-raising had received honours at twice the rate of companies which dominate the economy.

The situation is one for the attention of Lord Shackleton and his independent Political Honours Scrutiny Committee, surely, if the Labour Research Department's argument for the correlation of honours and funds for the Tory cause is accurate. We are reminded a little of the scandal of the sale of peerages in the decade before World War One, when the price of such sales was the chief support of the secret funds of whichever party was in power. The whole unpleasant business was exposed by Cecil Chesterton's League for Clean Government, but it took twenty years for the practice to be forbidden.

BUY AND DISTRIBUTE

COMMON MARKET SUICIDE

A. K. Chesterton's exposure of the threat posed to the integrity and unity of this country by membership of the E.E.C.

5 for £2, 10 for £3.50 from

CANDOUR PUBLISHING COMPANY

AUDI ALTERAM PARTEM

by NOEL HUNT

**Hear the other side (St. Augustine).*

In a recent speech "warning" South Africa against daring to defend herself against terrorist attacks, the Foreign Secretary is reported to have said that *apartheid* is "morally abhorrent". He did not say why or to whom the policy is abhorrent. The implication, that it is abhorrent to all but South Africans, is simply not true. Racial separation is practised, and very sensibly so, by Jews, Muslims and caste Hindus. It is the norm throughout black Africa. One has yet to hear any condemnation of this from the West. Apparently, it is only when the white man wishes to keep his own stock pure that racial separation becomes 'morally abhorrent'.

In the same report the Foreign Secretary is quoted as having said: "*Apartheid* and the absence of a form of government which has the consent of all the people cast a long shadow over Britain's relations with South Africa . . . Our rejection of *apartheid* and the oppression linked with it . . ." The form of government which the Foreign Secretary finds so repellent consists of a division of the country into black and white areas. In the white areas white interests are paramount. In the black areas black interests are equally paramount. Whites may live and work in black areas under permit but may not vote there. Blacks may live and work in the white areas under permit but may not vote there. What is there either legally or morally objectionable about this? If it is oppressive, then both races are equally oppressed. Certainly the blacks do not seem to find the system oppressive, since they heartily approve of Bantustans and, in fact, have petitioned to have several others set up.

No Zulu would think of settling in a Tswana Bantustan, and vice versa. One has yet to hear any man of goodwill condemning this blatant bit of black racialism. Apparently, racialism only becomes objectionable to the liberal when the white man prohibits permanent black settlement in his area. Black prohibition of permanent white settlements never earns an unkind word.

In the white areas, one of the problems which plagues the South African government is the enormous influx of blacks from all over Africa. They walk for hundreds, sometimes thousands of miles and enter the Republic illegally to work there. They know better than to intrude into a Bantustan — for all blacks are very sensibly ardent racists — so they flood into the white areas. They know that their

presence is illegal, that they are liable to prosecution and that they cannot claim the benefit of South Africa's excellent system of industrial legislation because they are there illegally.

Nonsense About "Oppression"

Since men of goodwill never tire of telling us that separate development equals oppression — though never how or why — then these illegal entrants to South Africa must have undergone hardships and discomforts to enter South Africa so that they can be oppressed. Either they are masochists to a man, revelling in being down-trodden and oppressed, or the man of goodwill is as usual talking nonsense. Whatever we may think about the matter, the blacks concerned do not think that they are oppressed or they would not go there.

In the Bantustans the laws are made by blacks for blacks. The blacks do not, in general, reject the Bantustan concept, so they apparently do not find it as oppressive as the Foreign Secretary does. The illegal entrants to the white areas know the laws they break and the risks they run, but do not seem to find them oppressive enough to stay at home. If the people most concerned, that is the majority of blacks, do not think that they are oppressed one wonders why we persist in interfering in what is not our business.

All the Bantustans have laws, passed by their parliaments, forbidding whites to own land in the area for no other reason than that they are white. The same laws prohibit land ownership or permanent residence by any black not a member of the tribe of the Bantustan. Is this not the crudest of racialistic decrees? If so, why do we never hear a murmur of protest from those who are so vociferous when the white passes a similar law? If it is wrong for the whites to do it, why is there no international outcry against the blacks when they do? If it is right for the blacks to do it in their own areas, then why is it wrong for the whites to do it in theirs? Or is it argued that only the white can be guilty of oppression and racialism. Or is it perhaps morally acceptable for the black to oppress and discriminate against the white, but not the reverse?

SWAPO Racialism

Another nugget from this rich vein of claptrap goes: "A settlement which allowed the people of Namibia to determine their own future would be

clearly in Western interests. It would reduce, not increase, the opportunities for external meddling . . ." Since Britain and America are two of the chief external meddlers, they ought to know.

South West Africa is an enormous country. Apart from the Afrikaner, English and German racial groups there are something like fourteen tribal, that is to say racial, groups. They all heartily detest and despise each other. They range from the Herero, who are not Bantu at all but Hamitic cattle-owners, to the Berg Damara known to their neighbours by an epithet perhaps best translated as "walking drug"! Britain and America seem to think it possible to have a form of government which will have the consent of all these disparate people. They do not say how it can be done, just that it can. They probably believe in Santa Claus and the Tooth Fairy as well! It is not possible. Further, our politicians know that it is not going to happen, whatever they may say in public. The darling of the politicians, and their chosen leader for "Namibia" when Freedom dawns on it, is Mr. Sam Nujoma of SWAPO, which is a terrorist organisation. Now Mr. Nujoma has said several times in public that when he takes over as Prime Minister of "Namibia" there will not be a multi-racial government: there will be a black one. Our politicians must know this, yet Mr. Nujoma's remarks have been greeted with a deafening silence in the West. This is indeed strange, is it not, when one considers how quick to condemn any naughty manifestations of white racialism are our press, media, politicians and clerics.

Since Britain and America desire so earnestly to see peace and stability in South West Africa, let us see how that prestigious body, the Organisation for African Unity, views the matter. This Organisation has published a "Programme for Action" which must be well known to our media and politicians. One paragraph reads: "We cannot compromise with any white government, extreme or liberal, or agree to multi-racial nonsense. We are determined to destroy all traces of White civilisation. The rivers of the South are to run red with the blood of the White tyrants and their children". You cannot say that that is not frank, can you? Our politicians and their advisers must know of Mr. Nujoma's views on the future of "Namibia", and those of the Organisation for African Unity. Yet we continue to keep up the pretence that there will be a "multi-racial government with the consent of all the people".

Let us be quite clear about what we are allowing our politicians to do in South West Africa: we are planning to destroy a legally elected government and a firm friend of the West, and to replace it with a

black government determined to "destroy all traces of White civilisation". One wonders why we seek to do this, and for whose benefit we act.

Perhaps it is worth pointing out that South Africa's real crime in the eyes of the West is not *apartheid*, as is claimed. What the spokesmen of the West, both public and private, find intolerable about South Africa is not *apartheid* but a law called The Suppression of Communism Act. This law, and its ancillary legislation, though never mentioned, is the real reason for the campaign against South Africa. Under that law, uniquely, the Communist Party is banned and a communist treated as a criminal. It is her rigidly anti-communist stand, not her political institutions, which have brought South Africa hostility from men of goodwill everywhere. They complain loudly about the oppressive "banning laws". What they really object to is the fact that they are extremely effective. It is odd, indeed, that a country so determinedly anti-communist should be execrated by Britain and America, who also profess to be opposed to communism.

Exclusively available to subscribers

PORTRAIT REPRODUCTION OF **A. K. CHESTERTON**

Price: 50p.

CANDOUR PUBLISHING COMPANY
FOREST HOUSE, LISS FOREST, HANTS.

FREEMASON NEWS

A Report on the Menace of Secret Societies

Single copy 33p; 10 copies £1.82 (incl. postage)

from

*Candour Publishing Company,
Forest House, Liss Forest, Hampshire
GU33 7DD.*

The Publishing Event of the Year!

HOLOCAUST NEWS

The Newspaper that exposes

THE MYTH OF THE SIX MILLION

Only 30p. (including postage) from

CANDOUR PUBLISHING COMPANY

LIGHT AND BITTER

by JANUS

Ever Optimistic

A £37,000 drive by the Home Office in London and Wolverhampton to recruit Black and Asian men and women to be prison officers has resulted in only *two* applicants who could pass the standard written aptitude test. A West Indian who attempted it obtained a single mark out of a possible 115 — for getting his name right! Incredibly, the pass mark of 60 is set at the educational level of 12 to 13-year-olds. The multi-racial zealots of the Home Office do not give up easily, however. A new recruitment campaign is underway with a brochure showing a Black prison officer handling complicated close-circuit television equipment with confidence, while a dull-looking White officer is in the background doing a menial job!

A Bella Donna by any other name . . .

A lot of MP's have given Mrs. Joan Maynard a sound ticking off, even some members of her own party, for her outburst on the I.R.A. This ludicrous woman had said she objected to the terrorists being thus described because after all, what would *we* feel like if there were an "occupying army" in Britain. By the same token *I* have strong objections to a person being described a "Labour Supporter" who has made contributions to the Morning Star and thought to save militant rioters from expulsion. But I suppose I would be accused of defamation if I were to call her something else!

Child Molesters

The insidious pressures and influences to which children are subjected in schools know no bounds. The ideologues of the Inner London Education Authority have recently instructed all their teaching staff "to work actively to eradicate racism, sex discrimination and class-consciousness" from their schools, which means, in effect, *white* racism, *male* discrimination and *middle-class* consciousness. The London borough of Brent wants to ensure its appointments procedure does not conflict with the ILEA directive, so its advertisements for teachers in *The Times* proclaim that "applications are welcome from candidates regardless of Race, Nationality, Ethnic or National Origins, Age, Marital Status, Sex, Sexual Orientation and from Registered Disabled Persons." Phew! Soon it will be discrimination to expect a teacher to be able to read and write.

THE GREENHAM UNCOMMON

How the Bow Street Runners
Must gyrate in the grave
For Greenham Common coppers,
Their beat — a slum enclave.

That job, softly to pedal
On blatant broken laws,
And hardly dare to meddle
In Revolution's straws.

A company, quite minor,
But monstrous, none the less,
Of women — camped in squalor,
An Airfield to impress?

Indecent exposure
Part of the forest scene,
Shades of the composure
Once knit round guillotine.

Hard-core and aberration
Of womanhood, they sit
In filth and degradation
And voice protests — in spit!

Purblind, perforce, the policeman
In passive patrolling —
Athwart his path, a woman,
Per se, urinating.

Their toiletries adorning
Their person and the fence,
Revulsion's early warning,
The Red Alert — from tents!

'Twould seem the inspiration
Of this female hard-core
Is "outlaw sanitation",
Pre-empt the filth of war.

B. E. GIGGS.

A. K. IN RHODESIA

A C120 cassette tape of A. K. Chesterton and Leslie Greene debating the perils of multi-racialism with Colonel David Stirling in Salisbury, Rhodesia, in July 1957.

PRICE £4 (£6 OVERSEAS)

Candour Publishing Company,
Forest House, Liss Forest, Hampshire.

A.K.C. ACADEMY MOVES AHEAD

The last couple of days of 1983 saw another successful seminar at the A. K. Chesterton Academy, by courtesy of *Candour's* Editor. The dozen visitors included several newcomers, although the main aim was to re-cap on what has already been achieved and to make plans for the next stage of the Academy's vital work.

The introductory lecture covered ground probably familiar to *Candour* readers: with the amount of effort devoted by our opponents to distorting the minds of the young, it is vital that patriotic Britons help to launch a counter-attack, for obvious reasons, it will have to start with a small and limited action. With little prospect of either lecturers or students from the general public, both must initially be drawn from groups already involved in the political fray. There is, however, no harm in that, for these are the very people whose political knowledge and practical abilities must be increased if they are to be as effective as possible in spreading the Nationalist message.

A lecture on the ways in which the multi-racialist establishment seeks to repress dissent led to a useful discussion on the strategy and tactics needed to advance our Cause. It was felt that there are valuable lessons still to be learnt from the experiences of the League of Empire Loyalists.

Although the day had begun with a run and a hard morning's outdoor work, the afternoon concluded with a vigorous game of football. The ill-effects of commercialised Christmas were thus banished (more or less) in a day!

Trap For The Unwary

The second day followed the usual pattern. A run; breakfast; outdoor work until lunch; an afternoon of lectures and discussions broken up by yet another game of football. The work, involving clearing undergrowth from paths and digging out ditches between ornamental ponds, produced the now customary idiot covered in the vile rust-coloured mud which waits to trap the unwary young Nationalist! It is all, one lecturer assured us, good for building team spirit and self-confidence!

We also had an inspiring talk on the need and potential for a rural Nationalist community, based on a small-holding. As the two-part article by the late John O'Brien in recent issues of *Candour* made clear, a return to the land by large numbers of our

people is economically, strategically and socially vital to a future Nationalist Britain. The establishment now of a pilot scheme would provide a living show-piece for our ideals, as well as providing inspiration for patriots living in London, Birmingham and the other cess-pits of multi-racialism and usury.

Coming seminars will cover areas such as Nationalist economics, Distribution and political history. There will also be more workshops on aspects of practical politics — such as silk-screen printing and the production of local leaflets. A video camera is available to help with the training of public speakers by showing them their mistakes and to get them used to press interviews.

Pressing Needs

Most of the next batch of students have already been chosen and dates for a full series of seminars will be set shortly. Thus the A. K. Chesterton Academy is already beginning to meet a long-awaited need in the British Nationalist Cause. The venture does, however, have pressing needs if it is to function well.

The first, predictably, is for money to pay for essential repairs and basic teaching aids. Donations of equipment would be welcome, from garden tools to cooking utensils and clean blankets. Sports equipment and camping gear would be appreciated. Particularly wanted, since this is an educational trust, are books and magazines. Office equipment would help us adopt a more professional approach.

The point to remember is that this venture is not some intellectual side-show on the fringe of our Cause. The youngsters who attend it go back to their homes and day-to-day activities. If the Academy can increase their knowledge and skills, as well as making them fitter and more idealistic, then it will be immeasurable service to the British nation. Does it not have a *right* to your support?

FATIMA AND THE GREAT CONSPIRACY

Mrs. Deirdre Manifold's best-selling book unravels the Wall Street-Kremlin conspiracy and traces it back to its roots in Reformation times.

**NOW AVAILABLE, PRICE £3, FROM
CANDOUR PUBLISHING COMPANY**

JOIN THE REVOLT AGAINST THE BANKERS

Below is the statement of a case which the 'Our Country, Our Credit' Group has put to the Leader of Liverpool City Council, one of the militant local authorities in revolt against the Government (bankers') policy of curbing local authority expenditure. At present they are on a collision course with the Government, and the Liverpool M.P., David Alton, has said publicly that the Departmental Ministers concerned are "limbering up", preparing legislation which would enable them to put in a commissioner to run the Authority over the heads of the councillors, thus disenfranchising the electorate. Liverpool OCOG supporters are putting it to the Council, backed by an account of the Guernsey Experiment and a reference to not dissimilar action taken by Liverpool City Council in 1793, that this is a much more sensible course to take, and will tie-up with the revolt against the bankers and the intolerable burden of their debts in South America.

The case is one which *Candour* readers could put to their own local authority. It is not at all unlikely that if one authority gave a lead in taking the recommended action, others would follow. The 'ace' in the OCOG hand, and in the hand of any such local authority or *Candour* reader taking such action is that the Treasury not only do not, but *cannot*, deny that non-repayment money has already for years in the UK been buying UK products and it has been happening with a falling inflation rate.

THE TREASURY AND A VITAL FACT —

Since the matter has obvious relevance to the stand your Council are making against Government curbs on Local Government expenditure, we wish to draw the attention of your Council to an extremely important fact.

As you know, money normally comes into the hands of consumers as *repayable money*. For example, wages are either paid out of an employer's working capital or out of money he has borrowed from a bank. In either case the money has to be recovered, i.e. *repaid*, if the employer is to remain solvent. The employer receives the money back through the agency of prices, which are increased to cover the amount paid out on wages. The same goes for money made available, whether by a bank or other source, to either central or local government. It is *repayable* (i.e. borrowed) money.

During the three years 1980, 1981 and 1982, approximately £15,000 million came into the UK economy from balance of payments surpluses. This money, of course, was repayable, and thus a charge on prices, *in the countries from which it came*, BUT . . . **THE TREASURY DO NOT DENY:**

(a) That this money was *an addition* to the money already being spent by UK customers on buying UK products, and

(b) That so far as the UK economy is concerned it was not a charge on UK prices; that it was *non-repayable money* in the UK economy, and

(c) That the record (Government statistics) itself shows that throughout this period the rate of inflation

came down; that is to say, the extra money, *because it was non-repayable*, did not in fact raise prices, and

(d) That the three nations which over many successive years have had balance of payments surpluses — West Germany, Japan and Switzerland — have been the three nations which have had the lowest inflation rates: they have also been the most prosperous.

THE TREASURY ARE MOST ANXIOUS TO CONCEAL THOSE FACTS because, although theoretically, under the 1946 Bank of England Act, the Bank of England is subordinate to the Treasury (a fact confirmed to us by a QC, MP), in fact the bankers dominate the Treasury. That is why, although they are unwilling and unable to deny any of the points set out above, they try to confuse the issue. That is why the subject is taboo among politicians.

However, elsewhere, in Latin America, for instance, the taboo has been cast aside, and the politicians are facing up to the bankers. At the invitation of the President of Ecuador they are to meet in mid-January to decide what can be done to escape from the burden of overseas debt incurred as a direct result of the fight to obtain non-repayable money from a balance of payments surplus of which they are the victim, or loser, or deficit nations. The position was put succinctly in an admirable Report by the London Chamber of Commerce dated 12th. May, 1942 — a Report since suppressed by action of the bankers. This is what they said:

"If some nations have 'favourable' balances, it necessarily follows that others have 'unfavourable'

ones . . . It is an obvious absurdity that nations should regard it as necessary to export their real wealth, not for the purpose of paying for imports, but in order to solve their domestic problems by *passing it on to others.*"

The Report continues by pointing out the need "for the distribution internally of the purchasing power necessary to enable the nations to consume the whole of their own production."

The nations who are having the problems *passed on* to them are the Third World nations. Not only do they suffer the deficiency common, as the London Chamber points out, to all nations, but they have the additional deficiency caused by their internal purchasing power going abroad to buy the surplus exports.

These nations who are willing to fight the bankers are the natural allies of Liverpool City Council and Liverpool rate-payers and the Liverpool poor who are the victims of the Government's (the bankers') policy. There could hardly be a more propitious time for Liverpool City Council to represent to the Government the unanswerable case which exists for the Government to order the Bank of England to issue non-repayable credit so that Liverpool social services can be maintained and rates be lowered.

We wish to urge this course on you; and at the same time suggest you send a message to the President of Ecuador, indicating what you have done, and suggesting that they take similar action with their central banks.

HELP BOOST CANDOUR SALES

How often do you find yourself in a library, a hotel lounge, of talking to someone on the bus or train, where you could usefully leave or give away a copy of *Candour* — if you had a copy on you at the time?

Keep a copy in your pocket from this day on to 'plant' when a suitable opportunity arises. The number of new readers we can, and do, get this way is surprising.

To have a copy handy in your pocket, you need a regular supply in your home. So order a stock of ten copies of this issue straight away by sending us only £3.

Remember — *Candour* is YOUR journal and its survival depends on YOUR support. *So let's hear from you today!*

ROASTED

Britain had a little lamb,
A meaty mountain, so,
Exported it to 'partner', France
Who didn't want to know.

Les Fermiers of Alencon
With Gallic carcass-ide
Determined that "They shall not pass"
As "All for one" they cried.

Thus, Francais poor and needy
Got some free lamb chops
And "art nouveau" was made to show
"No way fit for French shops".

The gendarmes refereed this
With "entente cordiale"
And Maginot' significance —
A cynical "trop mal".

Britain like a little lamb
Once moore to slaughter led
Observed, the sauce was rather strong —
Was very much up-fed.

Their rotten milk, their apples,
Now, kicks up the arse;
But there, we're also 'donkey'
In the Common Market farce.

So we protest most strongly
But won't retaliate,
Must Conserve the British banquet
For the International plate.

B. E. BIGGS.

Read

OPEN SESAME

An anthology of the poems of

B. E. BIGGS

published in *Candour*, 1967-80.

Available now for only £1

CANDOUR PUBLISHING COMPANY,

Forest House, Liss Forest,
Hampshire.

LETTERS TO THE EDITOR

Madam — In a recent issue of *Candour* a thoughtful article by Frank Brooks suggested that we need a Christian Nationalist Party. This is something of which I am already firmly convinced, having fought as an Independent Christian Nationalist in the 1983 election.

The great majority of the British people have rejected any suggestion of national salvation from those who recognise no objective morality, only what is "good for the White man". Yet the need for large-scale repatriation stares us in the face. Those who have seen explosions of violence can never take the danger lightly. So any nationalist will see the vital need to reach an understanding with the many people of good will among the black and coloured communities. Without it we should play straight into the hands of those of our own race who welcome such alienations to trigger off the revolutionary violence they hope for.

I am reminded of my youth and of other dangerous occasions when swarms of angry bees could be "repatriated" only by the old shepherd, the one person in the village who seemed to have a rapport with bees. It certainly paid off for he had their full co-operation so that he never used force or even protective clothing and was never stung. If this is true of such tiny creatures the same must apply to a much greater extent when it is a matter of rational beings made in the image of their Creator. For if Racial Nationalism is really an ideology and not a mere reaction, then it stands to reason that it must be of universal application.

Indeed, I have found it to be so. During the campaign of verbal violence that surrounded my candidature for the National Front in the 1979 election, it was the few coloured people of my acquaintance who stood by me most loyally and influenced others to do the same. A young Hindu lady who asked for lodgings was ready to see there would be "nothing personal" towards her in my politics. Such legislation for the good of one's country, she said, was a perfectly legitimate aim and she respected it. Her own country had already put into operation a successful scheme of repatriation. With her company, and that of a sympathetic young Arab, in the house, I found myself worrying less about the possible activities of the Anti-Nazi League.

JOAN WHITE, Canterbury.

Madam — A Christian Nationalist Party would seem to be the perfect answer to the present day degradation of both Christian principles and the inherited and hard-won national ethic. For British posterity, both of these traditions require to be saved — salvaged is perhaps more apt — and thereby achieve a more immediate bonus for the indigenous British native — salvation!

But alas, who shall speak for the 'Christian' side of the partnership? Shall it be the Churchmen with their advocacy and material support for terrorism via the World Council of Churches? Shall it be the Churchmen who give *carte blanche* to homosexuals — even to the point of ordination, sometimes? Shall it be the Churchmen who myopically read "Thou shalt not kill" as Thou shalt instil . . ." the Holy Message abroad; albeit 'Thou' being a convicted murderer, released and presently ordained?

Spiritual with the secular in politics sounds an enticing admix but, alas again, Heaven help us if the current arbiters of the Christian scene should be wearing the pyjamas when that political marriage is consummated!

B. E. BIGGS, Cambridge.

REQUIESCANT IN PEACE

We regret to announce the death in January of Captain W. E. Doyle, an old and valued supporter of *Candour*. In recent years, he acted as leader of the Portsmouth Command of the Association of British Ex-Servicemen (ABEX). We mourn his loss and salute him as a patriot of the utmost valour.

The CANDOUR LIBRARY wishes to secure for its archives magazines, pamphlets, leaflets and bulletins issued by the White Defence League, National Labour Party and B.N.P. between 1957 and 1966. Please write to us c/o Forest House, Liss Forest, Hampshire.

John O'Brien's BLUE-PRINT FOR NATIONALIST SURVIVAL sets out a strategy for surviving nuclear war. Price 20 for £1 from Candour Publishing Co.